

REMARKS

As a preliminary matter, claim 27 stands objected to for informalities. Specifically, the Examiner has correctly noted that claim 27 was inadvertently labeled as “Previously Presented,” instead of the correct label “Currently Amended.” Claim 27 is correctly listed herein as being currently amended.

Claims 27-31 again stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Song et al. (U.S. 6,710,837). Because this rejection is merely a repetition of the previous rejection, Applicants maintain and incorporate by reference herein those arguments put forth on pages 4 through 9 of Amendment C, filed June 14, 2005. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider those arguments, and withdraw the outstanding Section 102 rejection based on Song. Additionally, Applicants have amended independent claim 27 solely in the interests of expediting prosecution, and Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the outstanding rejection in light of these amendments as well, and in light of the following remarks.

Applicants have further amended independent claim 27 herein to better clarify that each individual one of the assembly of plural orientation control elements is distinct and that the entire assembly is formed between adjacent repetitions of the first orientation control element. Even according to the Examiner’s marked-up version of Fig. 18 of the Song reference, Song cannot read upon claim 27 of the present invention.

According to the Examiner’s marked-up drawing, each individual branch of the protrusion pattern 170 that the Examiner asserts to constitute an individual one of “an

assembly of plural orientation control elements,” is shown to occur only once between any adjacent ones of the “first orientation control element” identified by the Examiner in the drawing. In other words, the Examiner has merely pointed out repetitions of an entire “second orientation control element” (labeled so by the Examiner himself), and not an assembly of plural elements that constitute a single second orientation control element. This distinction is not minor, and illustrates a primary difference between the present invention and Song.

Claim 27 of the present invention does not merely claim a “plurality of second orientation control elements,” as shown by the Examiner in his marked-up version of Song’s Fig. 18. Instead, claim 27 of the present invention recites that the second orientation control element itself, that is, each occurrence of the second orientation control element, is constituted by an assembly of plural orientation control elements having a same directivity, and that each individual one of the assembly is distinct. The Examiner’s marked-up version of Song’s Fig. 18 fails to demonstrate all of these limitations. Accordingly, for at least these additional reasons, the rejection should be withdrawn.

New claims 34-36 have been added to recite additional features of the present invention. All three claims depend from independent claim 27, and should be in condition for allowance for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to the patentability of independent claim 27. Additionally, each of these three claims recites additional features of the present invention that are not taught (or suggested) by Song, or any of the other cited

references of record. Entry, consideration on the merits, and allowance of new claims 34-36 are respectfully requested.

For all of the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that this Application, including claims 27-31 and 34-36, is in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney if a further interview would expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By



Josh C. Snider
Registration No. 47,954

Customer No. 24978

November 30, 2005

300 South Wacker Drive
Suite 2500
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Telephone: (312) 360-0080
Facsimile: (312) 360-9315
P:\DOCS\111768339\9Q4931.DOC